



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,490	04/22/2004	Yu Jen Chen	24061104 / TSMC2003-0457	6912
42717	7590	09/27/2010	EXAMINER	
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP			LONG, FONYA M	
IP Section			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2323 Victory Avenue				3689
Suite 700				
Dallas, TX 75219				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/27/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/829,490 Examiner FONYA LONG	Applicant(s) CHEN ET AL. Art Unit 3689
<i>– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –</i>		
THE REPLY FILED 08 September 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.		
1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:		
a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
NOTICE OF APPEAL		
2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).		
AMENDMENTS		
3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. 		
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		
4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).		
5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.		
6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		
7. <input type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: _____. Claim(s) objected to: _____. Claim(s) rejected: _____. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).		
9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).		
10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.		
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		
11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>		
12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached <i>Information Disclosure Statement(s)</i> . (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.		
13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.		
<i>/Janice A. Mooneyham/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3689</i>		<i>/FONYA LONG/ Examiner, Art Unit 3689</i>

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment to the system claims do not affect the structure being claimed. Therefore, it does not reduce or simplify the issues for appeal. Examiner asserts the functions being performed by the system claimed are fully capable of being performed by the prior art. Examiner asserts "while features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguish from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function." See *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been reconsidered but are not persuasive. Applicant's argument for Claim 1 are directed to amended claimed limitations which have not been considered. As per Claim 20, Applicant argues that the Yoshida and Shapiro combination fails to disclose "wherein the determination of the customer impact by the revision includes the customer has accessed a document." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner asserts that Yoshida et al. discloses system capable of searching according to a search scheme, a database to determine a customer impacted by the revision (Col. 3, Lines 61-63, discloses searching a database in response to the search request received). Examiner also asserts that Shapiro et al. discloses a system capable of determining who has accessed a document (Col. 4, Lines 43-65, via creating an audit trail which records when a document was accessed, from where, and by whom). Examiner asserts that the fact that these function are performed by a system to determine a customer who is impacted by a revision holds little, if any, patentable weight in the system claim since it has no affect on the structure of the system being claimed.